DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 743 JC 020 531

TITLE	Instructional Program Review Guidelines, Spring 2001.
INSTITUTION	Peralta Community Coll. System, Oakland, CA. Office of Educational Services.
PUB DATE	2001-03-00
NOTE	17p.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; *Educational Planning; Evaluation Methods; Institutional Evaluation; *Program Evaluation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Peralta Community College District CA

ABSTRACT

This document presents guidelines for program review at Peralta Community College District's (PCCD) (California) institutions. The primary objective of the program review process is to assure that PCCD's educational programs reflect student needs and encourage student success. The review process consists of five stages: (1) a discipline self-study with a written report, based on questions posed in this document; (2) a validation of the program's self-study report, with commentary on the recommendations made; (3) a consolidated summary report prepared by the Vice President of Instruction and forwarded to the President for review and comment; (4) a complete compilation of all reports and documents, with a final college summary to be submitted to the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor of Educational Services; and (5) various follow-up activities. This paper details each of the five stages and provides guidelines and suggestions for their execution. It also contains a format for program review, along with assessment questions in the areas of curriculum, instruction, student success, staffing and resources, staff development, community outreach and articulation, and accreditation. (EMH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 743

Peralta Community College District

Instructional Program Review Guidelines Spring 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Spinetta
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

TC020536

Judy E. Walters, Senior Vice Chancellor
Office of Educational Services

January 2001
5th Edition

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

In the spring of 2000, Peralta beta-tested a new Program Review process. Since then several discussions and consultations have taken place with numerous groups including the District Academic Senate, College Presidents, Deans of Instruction, Deans of Student Services, Assistant Deans, individual faculty members from departments and College Academic Senates. This document is a result of all this consultation. The basic concepts are still the same, but the procedures have been clarified and the number of questions have been reduced.

The primary objective of Program Review is to assure the quality of the PCCD educational programs; one that reflects student needs and encourages student success. By participating in the process of Program Review we not only will validate our success, but also we will demonstrate our commitment to innovation and continuous improvement.

Program Review is a process that allows faculty to look at what they are doing and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The results of program review are to be used in planning and budgeting. Planning includes division or unit plans, updating the College Educational Plan, and the Technology Plans. Budgeting includes requests in the annual budget development cycle, requests for hiring faculty, requests for instructional equipment, and developing Partnership for Excellence initiatives.

In addition to seeking information concerning the rigor and quality of a program for planning and budgetary reasons, Program Review is also information required to meet Board policy and our accreditation standards.

We wish to thank the many College faculty, staff, and administrators who have reviewed this manual, and the District staff of Institutional Development: Chuen Chan, JoAnn Phillips, Bruce Hawkins, and Sheryl Queen; and my assistant Pat Jameson, for their dedicated work and support.

Judy E. Walters, Senior Vice Chancellor
Educational Services

Norbert Bischof, President
District Academic Senate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Components of Program Review 2

Guidelines 4

Action Plan Deadlines 4

Definitions 5

College and Department Data To Be Provided 6

Instructional Program Review Format 8

INTRODUCTION

VISION STATEMENT

The Peralta Community College District (PCCD) will become an exemplary system by being responsive to the educational needs of our community, by providing learner-centered educational experiences and by being committed to innovation and continuous improvement.

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW

The primary objective is to assure the quality of the PCCD educational programs, one that reflects student needs and encourages student success. It is a systematic process for the collection, analysis and interpretation of data concerning a program and its curriculum. Validated recommendations for each program will be linked and incorporated into the unit's planning process, and decisions concerning schedule proposals, curriculum changes, budget development, and hiring practices. Management is responsible for coordinating the process and supplying data. Faculty is responsible for providing the analysis and making recommendations. Review of programs will be undertaken for the following specific purposes:

A. To evaluate how well an instructional program functions in relation to its objectives, the mission of the college, the college's institutional goals and priorities, the needs of the community, and the goals of the District.
B. To strengthen planning, decision-making, budget-building, programs, scheduling of courses, and requests for faculty and instructional equipment.
C. To influence program development and improvement (i.e., to determine how relevant the curriculum is to labor market needs and transfer functions).
D. To assess the inter-relationships and impacts of programs.
E. To improve the use of college and district resources.

PROCESS

The process consists of five stages. First is a discipline self-study with a written report, based on the questions posed in the Format Section of this document. The self-study will include a review of data collected by the Office of Institutional Research and any additional data the program may wish to collect. The written report will include an analysis of data, commentary, and finally, the program's plans to address the findings of the self-study. The report should use the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats (SWOT) approach to writing recommendations.

The self-study is followed by a Validation Team review of the program's self-study report with commentary of the recommendations made. The third stage is a consolidated summary prepared by the Vice President of Instruction and forwarded to the President for review and comment. The fourth stage is a complete compilation of all reports and documents with a final College Summary to be submitted to the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor of Educational Services. The fifth stage is follow-up activities.

COMPONENTS OF PROGRAM REVIEW

A. Stage One – Program Review Self-Study Committee

1. The Vice President of Instruction will coordinate and initiate the self-study activity.
2. The District Institutional Research Office will be responsible for providing the statistical data as described on page 7.
3. The appropriate Division Dean with the Department Chair (or appropriate faculty) will form a Program Review Committee consisting of faculty who will be responsible for conducting the self-study and submitting the report to the Division Dean. (Self-study Committees should consist of at least three people. The Chair shall be selected by the Committee.)
4. The self-study report is an in-depth analysis of an instructional program by teaching faculty. As an organizing tool, the concept of analysis from the standpoint of Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) is recommended. (Part-time instructors who wish to participate should be encouraged to do so.) If a program has no full-time faculty, part-time faculty shall be appointed by the Division Dean and compensated in accordance with contract rules.
5. The self-study report will address each section delineated in the guidelines (page 8).
6. The Division Dean will submit the self-study document, along with supporting documentation (e.g., evaluations, student progress, surveys, course outlines) to the Validation Team chair **by March 19th** .

B. Stage Two -- Validation

1. Validation Team members shall be selected at the same time as the Program Review Committee Team.
2. The Validation Team reviews and verifies the veracity of the self-study document including validating the SWOT analysis. The validation process **may** include visitation, observation, and analysis of a program/area by the team for the purpose of identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and validating the conclusions and recommendations.
3. The Validation Team shall be comprised of **at least 3 people:** a Division Dean not involved in the self-study, one or more faculty members outside the instructional program (selected by the Academic Senate), and one or more persons from outside the college. The person from outside the College could be from one or more of the following:
   a. Instructor at a four-year institution in the same instructional program
   b. Instructor at another community college in the same instructional program
   c. High school instructor in the same instructional program
   d. Community advisory committee member
4. Validation Team members from outside the District may receive an honorarium to cover travel expenses.
5. The Division Dean serving on the team **shall chair** the validation team.
6. Duties of Validation Team Members:
   a. Study the self-study report prepared by the faculty, including analysis of enrollment data.
   b. Meet with the faculty who conducted the self-study.

c. Examine facilities, teaching materials, supplies, and equipment presently being used for the program.
d. Interview a representative sampling of faculty and students.
e. Consider administering a student survey of needs and recommendations. (The Team **may** wish to look at the student satisfaction survey, or the campus climate survey, if one was administered in the program area being reviewed.)
f. Meet with all Validation Team members to prepare a written summary of findings.
g. Provide a written report of findings and recommendations to the Program Review Committee (Stage One). The Division Dean chairing the Validation Team (Stage Two) shall prepare the written response.
h. The Validation Team shall meet with the Program Review Committee to review findings regarding the written recommendations, if necessary.

7. The Validation Team shall review the self-study report and complete its own written report **by April 23rd**.

C. Stage Three – Discussion with Vice President of Instruction and Program Review Report to the President

1. All reports and responses will be submitted to the Vice President of Instruction **by April 25th**.
2. The Vice President of Instruction shall meet with the Division Dean and Program Review Committee to discuss the Self-Study and Validation Team's recommendations.
3. The Vice President shall prepare a summary evaluation of the report including recommendations and shall present it to the College President **by May 23rd**. An informational copy also will be forwarded to the College Academic Senate President.

D. Stage Four – Reports Submitted to the District Office

The College President shall prepare and submit the College's Summary along with the Self Study and Validation Team Review Reports to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Educational Services **by June 4th**.

E. Stage Five – Follow-Up Activities

The Senior Vice Chancellor of Educational Services will facilitate a Districtwide meeting of all program faculty undergoing review. The purpose will be for discussion and identification of follow-up activities concerning recommendations in the reports of programs reviewed Districtwide.

GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY REPORT (STAGE ONE)

(1) Prepare an overall description of the program as an introduction to the Self-Study; (2) analyze and evaluate the data (to be used in developing responses to the questions A-G); and (3) address each of the instructional areas of emphasis using the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats approach to assessment (A-G) and make recommendations, if appropriate, for both long term and short term goals. To assist the Program Review Committee in this task, a series of questions follows each of the six instructional emphasis areas as a **GUIDE** for developing responses. The committee should also review the College's Mission Statement, Institutional and Division Goals and Priorities, and College Educational Plan, and should determine how they relate to evaluations and recommendations. *The Peralta Colleges are reviewing their educational plans and the committees should use mission statements and materials from those documents.*

Overall Description

The self-study shall begin with a short description of the program with a general statement of the primary goals and objectives of the program, using the College's Mission Statement, institutional and division goals and priorities, and College Educational Plan.

ACTION PLAN DEADLINES

A. **January 30 & 31st Training Sessions** – Introduction to Program Review--Faculty selected for Program Review Committee and Validation Teams.
B. **February 5th** – Dean's Meeting
C. **March 19th** – Self Study completed
D. **April 23rd** – Validation Team report completed
E. **April 25th** – All reports submitted to Vice President of Instruction
F. **May 23rd** – Final report to College President and Academic Senate President.
G. **June 4th** – College President submits College Summary along with reports to the Senior Vice Chancellor of Educational Services.

Definitions and Data to be Provided

(Instructional Program Review)

Student Data Sheet: This covers--by semester--data for your program during the period from Fall Semester 1997 through Spring Semester 1999, excluding summer sessions. Information contained is as follows:

1. FTEF (Full Time-Equivalent Faculty): indicates in full-time equivalents the total number of full-time and part-time equivalent instructors teaching in your program (a full-time instructor teaching overload [extra service] is included in the total). Example: an instructor teaching five three-unit classes generates one FTEF (3 x 5 = 15 "A" hours), which is the semester teaching load for one equivalent full-time instructor.

   You should project your faculty needs for the next two academic years based upon growth patterns, enrollment reductions, facility/resource availability, and/or curriculum implications.

2. FTES (Full-time Equivalent Students): indicates the number of full-time equivalent students generated by all the courses offered each semester in your program. An FTES is calculated by multiplying the number of students in a course [x] the number of hours per week for the course (not units) [x] the number of weeks (17.5) in the semester and dividing this sum by 525 (35 weeks x 15 hours).

3. WSCH (Weekly Student Contact Hours): The number of hours generated per week in each class. E.g., a 3-hour class with 35 students produces 105 WSCH. This 3-hour class represents 20% of an FTEF TEACHING LOAD. To reach a full-time teaching load, this instructor would teach five 3-hour classes or 15 equivalent "A" hours. This instructor would then generate a 525 WSCH (5 classes x 105 WSCH = 525 WSCH). The institutional goal is 525 WSCH per FTEF.

4. WSCH/FTEF (Weekly Student Contact Hours per FTEF): the average goal for the institution, as stated in the contract, should be for the College to maintain 525 WSCH (weekly student contact hours) or 17.5 FTES as a measure of productivity, remembering that some programs by their very nature will fall above or below this FTES goal. Nevertheless, we need to be aware that if the College as a whole falls significantly below this FTES goal, our fiscal stability could be affected, and ability to provide resources could be impacted.

5. FTES/FTEF: indicates the number of FTES earned by each FTEF. This figure is obtained by dividing the number of FTES generated each semester by the number of FTEF each semester. Remember, the overall institutional goal should be 17.5 FTES for each FTEF, though this is not possible in programs with lower-allowed-enrollment classes, as explained above under #3.

6. Total Student Enrollments: remember, this is not headcount but total enrollments for each class in your program: if a student takes three classes, she or he-generates three enrollments.

7. Total Classes: this is a total of all the classes offered in the program. If there are two classes taught by the same instructor at the same time (concurrent), this represents one class offering (counted as one class section). Independent Study (049) classes are not treated as a separate class, but their hours are included to help generate FTES.

COLLEGE & DEPARTMENT DATA BOOKS TO BE PROVIDED

A. Student Demographics

Enrollment by Gender
Enrollment by Ethnicity
Enrollment by Age
Enrollment by Load
Enrollment by Major
Enrollment by Goal

Educational Level
Enrollment Status
Matriculation Status

Day & Evening
EOPS
DSPS
Financial Aid

B. Faculty Demographics

Faculty by Ethnicity (contract & hourly)
Faculty by Gender (contract & hourly)

C. Degrees and Certificates

Degrees & Certificates Awarded by Major
Degrees & Certificates Awarded by Gender (C)
Degrees & Certificates Awarded by Ethnicity (C)

D. Student Retention, Completion, Withdrawal

Completion Rates
Withdrawal Rates
Retention Rates

E. Grade Distribution Trends

Grade Distribution by Course
Grade Distribution by Faculty Status (D)

F. Load Indicators

By Department & Course

Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES)
Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF)
Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH)
FTES per FTEF
WSCH per FTEF
Enrollment
Average Class Size

By Contract & Hourly Status

FTEF, FTES & WSCH
FTES per FTEF
WSCH per FTEF

G. Expenditures

Expenditures By Activity (D)

H. Cross-campus Departmental Data

Load Indicators by College
District Grade Distribution: Courses Offered At More than One College

Appendix

Flow of Transfer Students, CPEC Student Profiles (C)
Success, Completions, Retention, Drop, Persistence Rates, GPA (C)
Partnership for Excellence (PFE) (C)

C: College Data Book Only *D: Department Data Book Only*

PERALTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Instructional Program Review FORMAT

College: _____ Date: _____

TITLE OF PROGRAM: _____

Self-Study Committee Members: _____

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chair: _____

Validation Committee Members: _____

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chair: _____

Overall Description and Assessment of the Program

The self-study shall begin with the College's Mission Statement and Institutional Goals and Priorities. This is followed with a short description of the program, a general statement of the primary goals and objectives of the program, any unique characteristics, concerns or trends affecting the program, and any significant changes or needs anticipated in the next three years. Please include the degrees and certificates the Program currently offers. Remember that this is broad, general assessment versus the more detailed responses and recommendations for both long term and short term covered in the six instructional emphases areas (A-G). **(Depending upon the program, some of this information may be found in your College Educational Plans.)**

Include College's Organization Chart.

*[**Note:** Opposite some of the following questions are listed corresponding sections, which refer to Data Book sections.]*

A downloadable version of the Instructional Program Review Format in MS Word is available at ***http://www.peralta.cc.ca.us/district.htm#edsvs***

A. Curriculum

1. List the courses and the date of the most recent course outline update

2. What are the Program's methods for evaluating the contents of course offerings? (E.g., is curriculum current, appropriate and effective?)

3. Describe how the course outlines have been updated to follow Title V Regulations, e.g., prerequisites, co-requisites, advisories, and VATEA recommendations. List courses with prerequisites and describe the validation process used for each prerequisite for each course.

4. In what way do courses/programs (if applicable) support general education or other instructional programs? If this is a vocational program, use labor market data to support importance of program

5. What procedures are being used to assure that current curriculum is adequately meeting the needs of students. If this is a vocational program, what role have the advisory committees played in curriculum review?

6. What has been done to validate the appropriateness of the degree and certificate requirements offered by the Program?

7. With what institutions have the courses in this program been articulated? Validate through ASSIST and/or CAN.

RECOMMENDATIONS

B. Instruction

1. How are goals established for student learning and what methods are used to assess whether the goals are met?

2. What methods are used by the Program to maintain the integrity of academic standards and achieve consistency within the discipline, particularly in regards to multiple section introductory classes?

3. To what extent are writing skills, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking reinforced in this Program?

4. To what extent is the Program encouraging the use of successful and innovative teaching methodologies/instructional strategies that involve students in the learning process?

5. How has technology affected your delivery of instruction?

6. Discuss the FTES trend of your department (e.g., profile by instructional delivery method such as lecture, Lab., directed studies, TV; and by accounting methods such as short and full term courses). (See section F)

7. What *instructional* initiatives have been used to increase the Program's FTES? (E.g., alternative scheduling, telecourses, distance education) (See section F)

8. What other opportunities for learning exists in the Program outside of the formal classroom, e.g., field trips, guest lecturers, travel?

RECOMMENDATIONS.

C. Student Success

1. Based on the following success indicators (course completion rate, success rate, grade distribution, retention rate) discuss your department's trend. (See sections E,H)

2. What programmatic initiatives has the Program made to meet the needs of matriculating (full and part-time) students? For example, do we have full course offerings, job placement, tutoring, facility and equipment access, creative scheduling, student services, office hours, library services?

3. What has the Program done to formalize links with support services for students (e.g. counseling, DSPS, EOPS, Early Alert, tutoring services, study groups)? (See section A)

4. What efforts have been made by the Program to recruit students to the Program and provide liaison with the high schools?

5. What initiatives have been made to improve student retention, program completers, and transfers? What documentation exists that student learning occurs? (Sections C, D, H)

6. To what extent do non-traditional students participate in the Program course offerings? If participation rates are low, what has the Program done to encourage greater participation? What are the interventions used to identify and assist "at-risk" and non-traditional students.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

D. Staffing & Resources (Including equipment and facilities)

1. Are the staffing and facilities, including equipment and location adequate to all the courses offered by your department? (See section G)

2. What staffing factors influence the effectiveness of the Program (e.g., part-time/full-time ratios, dependence on overloads, number of staff)? (See section B)

3. What support services are used by the Program, e.g., learning resources, counseling services, tutors, etc.?

4. To what extent are there adequate resources in the Library/Learning Resource Center to support the Program?

RECOMMENDATIONS.

E. Staff Development

1. What areas of focus have been provided within the last two years and what plans being identified for future faculty/staff development? (See section B)

2. What evidence is there that faculty are staying current in their respective disciplines and instructional methodologies? (For example, workshops, conferences, course work, related work experience, advanced degrees.)

3. What recognitions and/or accomplishments have the faculty and staff received? (e.g., awards, publications, promotions, memberships, etc.)?

RECOMMENDATIONS.

F. Community Outreach and Articulation

1. What has the Program done to establish linkages with the community and cooperation with the secondary schools, Regional Occupational Program (R.O.P) and four-year institutions (if applicable)?

2. If this is a vocational Program, what noteworthy achievements have resulted from involvement with Advisory Committees?

3. What other community outreach activities have been initiated by the Program?

4. What documentation exists of the success of these activities?

RECOMMENDATIONS.

G. Accreditation

Review the College's latest Accreditation Self Study Report (or Mid-Term or Focus Report, whichever is the latest document).

1. Individually list each recommendation that relates to your program.

2. Indicate how your program is addressing each one of these items.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

PERALTA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

Office of the Vice Chancellor
Educational Services
333 E. 8th Street, Oakland, CA 94606

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").